ALFALFA (*Medicago sativa* 'Ranger')
Common leaf spot; *Pseudopiziza medicaginis*
Stemphlium leaf spot; *Stemphylium botryosum*

T. W. Massee, R. R. Romanko and C. E. Osgood, USDA-ARS, Kimberly, Idaho 83341, University of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho 83605; and SDS Biotech Corp., Boise, Idaho 83709, respectively.

EVALUATION OF BRAVO FOR DISEASE CONTROL IN SEED ALFALFA, 1982: A field with a 3-yr-old stand under irrigation on Portneuf very fine loam was used for this test. It was typical of seed fields in this area in that lower leaves were lost from shading and disease during the growing season. Different Bravo rates were applied to field length strips with a tractor mounted sprayed (boom width = 28.5 ft, PTO pump, T-jet 6503 nozzles, 28 psi). Three consecutive applications were made at, "full bloom" on Jun 27, and then Aug 4, and finally on Aug 27. The treatments were randomized and replicated 4 times. Seed pollinization was enhanced with adequate alfalfa leafcutting bees (*Megachile rotundata*), taken to the field on Jul 6. Field observations and a preharvest plant sampling were made to compare leaf loss. Also, the bee activity and flower set were observed on treatments. The seed crop was harvested by cutting a 15-ft swath from the middle of the strip with a self propelled combine.

Flower bloom and bee activity were normal on all plots. Extra leaf retention from the Bravo treatments was very evident and may have been responsible for increased seed size and yield.

Pints Bravo 500/A	Leaf retention index[1]	% thin seed[2]	Seed wt. (mg/seed)	Yield (lb/A)
0.	1.0	3.2 a[3]	1.79 a	352 a
2.	1.3	3.2 a	1.90 b	387 ab
3.	1.5	3.7 a	2.02 c	404 ab
4.	1.6	2.9 a	1.95 bc	436 b

[1] Ratio of leaves retained on treated plots as compared to a rating of 1.0 on untreated plots. [2] Small, sometimes flattened, seed rejected from the seed trade by failing to be returned on regular sieves and/or fanned out with air. This amount is not included in the yield column. [3] Numbers within a column when followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (P=0.05).

CEREAL AND FORAGE CROP REPORTS

Dr. John E. Watkins, Section Editor
Department of Plant Pathology
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583

Fungicide and Nematicide Tests 39:102